REMARKS

Claims have been redrafted to overcome the claim objections and claim rejections under 35 USC§112.

Support for the amendment of claim 1 can be found on page 4 lines 11-13 and former claim 2 (dehydration step), and page 4 lines 9 and 20-21, claim 3 (forced rehydration step).

Claims 2, 3 and 6 to 9 have been cancelled.

New claims 10-13 correspond to preferred ranges of former claim 1.

New claim 14 corresponds to preferred range of former claim 4.

Claim 5 has been amended to explain Test C as mentioned at page 5 lines 6-13.

Claims are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by PANDE et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

PANDE et al. does not describe a process in which the dehydration is carried out on a fluidized air bed dryer granulator and furthermore, does not disclose a forced rehydration step which is rapidly carried out on a fluidized air bed granulator.

Claim 1 is thus novel in view of PANDE et al.

Since claims 4-5, 10-14 depend on claim 1, they are also novel.

Claims are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by GIORDANO et al.

GIORDANO et al. describes works analog to those of PANDE et al.. Beta-cyclodextrins are completely dehydrated as indicated in page 154, in "materials and methods", and they are then rehydrated by allowing spontaneous water sorption from the atmosphere at ambient temperature. Thus, the rehydration step is not a forced rehydration step as in the process according to the invention.

Claim 1 is thus novel in view of GIORDANO et al.

Since claims 4-5, 10-14 depend on claim 1, they are also novel.

Claims are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANDE et al. and further in view of GABEL et al (US6,294,196).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

The first objections (two last paragraphs of page 7 and first paragraph of page 8 of the Office Action) concerning the lack of inventiveness of product claims are no longer applicable since product claims have been cancelled

Concerning the process according to the invention, it is important to stress on the fact that thanks to the specific conditions in which each of the two steps are carried out, it is possible to obtain a compressible beta-cyclodextrin which is stable in time, as it results from example 3 and from last column of the table of example 5.

According to PANDE et al. the beta-cyclodextrin is completely dehydrated and then is rehydrated in a natural and slow rate. There is no suggestion that a forced rehydration will enhance the stability and/or the compressibility of the obtained beta-cyclodextrin.

GABEL et al. relates to a wet granulation process of pharmaceutical products. Said process is completely different from the process according to the invention. In fact, wet granulation consists in wetting a powder in order to form aggregates. The thus obtained aggregates are then dryed.

There is thus no incentive to combine GABEL with PANDE.

Neither PANDE et al. nor GABEL et al., taken alone or in combination, teaches the invention as defined in claim 1.

Claim 1 is thus inventive.

Since claims 4-5, 10-14 depend on claim 1, they are also inventive.

Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Jose LIS et al

November 25, 2003
Date

By: William H. Wright
William H. Wright
Reg. No. 28,424

STURM & FIX LLP
206 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1213
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-4076
Phone: 515-288-9589
Fax: 515-288-5311